DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 956 JC 890 459

AUTHOR Clough, Carol E.
TITLE Development of Faculty Senate Bylaws at a California Community College.
PUB DATE Feb 89
NOTE 71p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; Collective Bargaining; *College Governing Councils; Community Colleges; *Faculty College Relationship; *Governance; *Policy Formation; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Bylaws; *Chabot College CA

ABSTRACT

In 1985, the faculty of Chabot College in California decided to revise the constitution and develop by-laws for the Faculty Senate on the grounds that the present operating rules were inadequate to help promote the Faculty Senate as an effective group within the governance structure of the college. A study was conducted to review the operating procedures and by-laws of effective faculty senates in the California Bay Area region and revise the existing operating rules of Chabot's faculty senate into by-laws. A literature review was conducted to identify factors that afect an organization's rules, explore the types of structures used by voluntary organizations, and examine existing constitutions, by-laws and other procedures. Other faculty senates were asked to send copies of their documents. An ad hoc committee studied the gathered information and submitted recommendations to the senate. Sections of the draft document were returned to committee for additional work. A year after the appointment of the committee, the operating rules were reviewed and guidelines were added, but the concept of by-laws was not accepted. The report on the process includes a review of the literature, the senate's 1985 and 1988 operating rules, the proposed by-laws, the 1987 constitution, a list of the articles in the constitution that were revised, and 78 references. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311956

DEVELOPMENT OF FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS AT A CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

by

Carol E. Clough, M.B.A.

Chabot College--Valley Campus

JC890459

A Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University

February, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Clough

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ABSTRACT

During 1965 and 1966, the faculty of Chabot College, which was founded in 1961, prepared a constitution and by-laws for its new Faculty Senate. During the ensuing years, the constitution was revised and the By-Laws were changed into Operating Rules. In 1985, the Senate decided to revise the 1980 constitution and spent almost two years in the process. The problem was that the present Operating Rules of the were inadequate to help promote the Faculty Senate as an effective group within the governance structure of Chabot College. The purposes of this study were (1) to review Faculty Senate Operating Procedures and/or By-Laws of effective senates within the California Bay Area region and (2) revise the existing Operating Rules of Chabot College's Faculty Senate into By-Laws.

The Faculty Senate President appointed an ad hoc committee to make recommendations to the Senate. Sturgis, the Senate's parliamentary code procedure, and the Academic Senate's Academic Senate Resource Book were examined for guidance. A literature search was completed for (1) factors that affect an organization's rules, (2) the types of structures used by voluntary organizations, and (3) constitutions, bylaws, and other procedures. Other faculty senates in the California Bay Area were sent letters requesting a copy of their documents. The ad hoc committee studied the information gathered, determined proposals, and made recommendations to the Senate. Sections of the drafted document were returned to committee for additional work on three occasions. A year

after the appointment of the committee, the Operating Rules were revised and addended with Guidelines. The concept of By-laws was not accepted.

It was recommended that (1) an annual orientation on the organization's goals and procedures be provided to all senators with additional training for new senators; (2) the Operating Rules with attached Guidelines be given to present and future senators, (3) the Senate review official documents on a four-year basis to determine if the contents still meet the Faculty Senate needs, (4) develop some form of evaluation tool to determine the effectiveness of the sections of the document, (5) forward this study to the Valley Campus faculty to use in its efforts to write its Constitution, By-Laws and/or Standing Rules as the campus achieves to single-college status.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT ii

LIST OF TABLES iv

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE 3

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 9

PROCEDURES 21

Limitations 24
Assumptions 25

RESULTS 26

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion 31
Implications 35
Recommendations 36

REFERENCES CITED 37

APPENDICES

A. Chabot College Faculty Senate Operating Rules, 1985 42

B. Draft 3 of Proposed By-Laws 45

C. Faculty Senate Revised Operating Rules and Guidelines, 1988 . 51

D. Chabot College Faculty Senate Constitution, 1987 57

E. Listing of Articles revised in Constitution 64

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Response Rate to Letter	26
2.	Types of Official Documents Used by Faculty Senates	27
3.	Types of Structures for Faculty Senates	27
4.	Type of Document Used For Written Procedures	28
5.	Votes Required to Amend	29

INTRODUCTION

During the early 1980's, Chabot College, a California community college of two campuses--Hayward and Livermore, experienced the possibilities of retrenchment of programs and of corresponding faculty, based upon limited state funding for community colleges. During a three-year period, the faculty became split in its allegiance to either the Faculty Senate or to the collective bargaining agent. Many faculty viewed the Faculty Senate as the pawn of the administration and its aims and the collective bargaining agent as an anti-administration unit, which supported faculty. The two faculty groups, which according to California legislation and the Administrative Code for Education represented the same faculty for different purposes, were in a political conflict mode, resulting in dissatisfaction among many faculty.

In 1985, a newly elected Faculty Senate President proceeded to run for president of the collective bargaining agent and won the election. This occurrence became controversial among the ranks of the Board of Trustees, administration, and faculty, as well as within the faculty. It evolved into a vote by the total regular and contract faculty on the propriety of one person serving in a dual role of president of both faculty organizations simultaneously. The result of the vote was that the Faculty Senate President could serve simultaneously as an executive officer of the collective bargaining agent but not as its president. This specific issue, accompanied with the broader issue of re-establishing the role of the Senate as an effective, representative unit of all faculty, forced the Faculty Senate to re-examine, update, and amend its Constitution and procedural documents.

The problem for this study was that the existing Operating Rules (Appendix A) seemed inadequate to facilitate the internal operations within the Faculty Senate and to promote it as an effective group within the governance structure. In some cases, the turnover of senators was frequent. On the other hand, a few long-term senators, who had served for more than six years, would not follow the present Operating Rules, thus 1) overturning or redirecting the prepared agenda and its discussion, 2) challenging the content and structure of the minutes, 3) blocking appointments of the senate task forces, and 4) impeding important discussions about particular faculty concerns, planning, and policy recommendations. No faculty member would serve as a parliamentarian for the Senate.

The purpose of this project was (1) to review the literature on primary and supplemental documents which affected an organization's operations, (2) to examine the Faculty Senate operating procedures and/or bylaws of effective senates within the California Bay Area region and (3) to revise the existing Operating Rules of Chabot College's Faculty Senate into By-Laws that correlated with the revised constitution. The Faculty Senate President appointed an ad hoc committee with two faculty from each campus to prepare recommendations for updating bylaws to the Faculty Senate with the writer, immediate Past President, serving as the facilitator.

The facilitator requested a copy of the Faculty Senate constitution, bylaws and/or operating rules from community colleges in the bay area and received nine replies. In the interim, the ad hoc committee met to determine what changes, additions, and deletions each member believed needed to be addressed, based upon experience with group processes in the senate. The Academic Senate Resource Book (1987) was consulted and

supplemental literature was reviewed. The collection of information was discussed at the next ad hoc committee meeting wherein some areas were delineated and assigned to the facilitator to prepare a preliminary draft. The next meetings of the ad hoc committee were spent debating and determining the bylaw recommendations to be presented in draft form to the Faculty Senate. The ad hoc committee decided to include at least two sections, which did not have committee consensus. The drafted By-Laws were presented to the Faculty Senate, and sections were returned to committee for further revision. The third draft of the By-Laws (Appendix B) was presented to the Senate toward the end of the school year. After considerable discussion, the motion to accept the ad hoc committee's recommendations was tabled until the next school year. During the interim, the proposed By-Laws were revised. The final document was divided into two parts: Operating Procedures and Guidelines (Appendix C). These two parts were approved at two October, 1988 Faculty Senate meetings.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Chabot College is a comprehensive community college, which has been operating for twenty-seven years. In October, 1961, during the college's first quarter of operation at a temporary campus, the faculty formed a Faculty Association. The California legislature's ACR (Assembly Concurrent Resolution) 48 of 1963 and the State Board of Education's Title 5, California Administrative Code, Section 131.6 of 1964 allowed local community college faculty the opportunity of forming faculty (academic) senates that would serve as a legitimate framework for a voice in policy formation and decision making (Case, 1971:29). In 1964-65, Chabot College's faculty took advantage of the opportunity and reformed

into a Faculty Senate, according to Standiford (1981:32, 126-127). In 1965, the faculty developed and confirmed a Faculty Senate Constitution, which was further approved by the Board of Trustees of the district. In 1966, the Faculty Senate prepared and approved the Senate's By-Laws, which dealt with procedural matters beyond the constitution.

In 1965, the California legislature passed the Winton Act, which affected Faculty Senates (Smith, 1971). Wright (1967:38-39) recounts that

> all matters involving the welfare of public school employees may be dealt with by designated negotiating councils. Each council is comprised of the representatives of any voluntary organization of employees . . . The relationships between the councils and the senates have not been clarified, however, and there are still areas of overlap or ambiguity.

Chabot College's Faculty Senate was one of many California faculty senates that served as the voluntary organization to deal with professional matters, along with proposing and negotiating wages and benefits. It revised its constitution in 1968 to adjust to the legislation.

In 1968-69, a few faculty from Chabot College, along with faculty from other California community colleges, met to form a statewide Academic Senate (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 1984:II-I). Conn (1986:2-4) reported that these faculty wrote a constitution, which was ratified by the local senates in 1969. In 1970, the constitution was replaced with By-Laws when the state Academic Senate submitted and secured the Articles of Incorporation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Chabot College's Faculty Senate revised its constitution and changed its By-Laws to Operating Rules.

In 1975, the California legislature passed SB 160, providing the opportunity for community colleges to vote in collective bargaining

agents. This law initiated strains among faculties of community colleges, as described by McConnell and Mortimer (1971), Hodgkinson (1974:144-145), Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (1978:82-89), and the Academic Senate (1984:VII-1). A 1980 revision was made to the Faculty Senate constitution so it would conform to the new collective bargaining contract, the SB 160, and current practice. In 1982, the Senate President attempted to return the Operating Rules into By-Laws through a revision process but did not succeed. However, the parliamentary procedure was change from Roberts Rules of Order to Sturgis Parliamentary Procedures. By 1984, Senate actions were almost stalemated by protests from the Social Science division that the procedures of main motions were not being followed to allow input from the faculty of the divisions. In 1985, the Senate revised the Operating Rules by replacing the words "main motion" with a motion regarding "significant issues" so that ordinary business could take place.

The most recent revision of the constitution (Appendix D) was started in autumn quarter of 1985 when the Faculty Senate President, at the request of the Senate, appointed an Ad Hoc Constitution Revision Committee to update the 1980 version. During a one and one-half year period, the Committee members reviewed the 1980 revised constitution and drafted proposed changes to articles stated in Appendix E. They discussed, debated, and prepared recommendations with and without total group agreement. The recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee were presented to the Senate for evaluation, debated, and, often times, returned to the committee for revision. They were reworked, presented again to the Senate, sometimes amended, and finally approved by the Faculty Senate over several meetings. The total faculty voted on the

constitutional changes article by article. The ratified Faculty Senate Constitution was accepted by the Board of Trustees in the Summer of 1987, in deference to its written policy regarding the Faculty Senate (Appendix E). The revised Constitution was included in the Chabot College Faculty Handbook (1987-88).

Throughout Chabot College's Faculty Senate's history, the Senate has served as a large executive committee with a President, a Pro-tempore President (to conduct meetings in the absence of the president), and elected representatives from the different faculty-staffed areas of the campus(es). The basic concept behind what originally had been deemed as Chabot College's democratic senate model, was premised on the idea that "power resides in the hands of the governed" (Scott, 1987:308). The president of the Faculty Senate brought external and institutional issues to the Senate, and senators brought issues of concern to the Senate from their constituency.

Some of the issues, such as changing College Hour from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., affected all faculty in various ways. These college-wide issues had been approached during the 1985-87 school years, in response to the Social Science faculty's protests, through a pilot experiment of the Senate by means of a vehicle referred to as a "Significant Motion." This Significant Motion held more importance even than the Main Motion referred to in the Operating Rules and constitution and in Sturgis (1966:35-39). It was designed to deal with an issue that (1) was extremely complex in its affect on faculty and students, (2) would affect the relationship of the faculty to the administration, or (3) would change college/board policy. At the time of the discussion of the issue at a Senate meeting, senators determined that an issue would be reported,

discussed, and voted on at the division or area level before being voted upon at the Senate. The senators prepared the wording of the Significant Motion at one meeting; the vote on it was usually two meetings later because the divisions met different days and weeks during a month. The senators were supposed to vote according to the majority of position of the faculty of their constituency. In the minutes, the vote results were recorded by number of AYES, number of NOES, and number of ABSTENTIONS.

The 1987-89 Senate President and senators held varying views about the process after using the Significant Motion on various issues, such as the acceptance of an Institutional Program Review, the movement of College Hour out of prime time, and the new Hiring Policy for faculty. On more than one occasion, when it was time to vote, some new information or concern was brought forward from the division discussions, and thus altered the thinking of the senators. In addition, senators sometimes were perplexed about how to vote based upon the complexities of attitudes of their constituency. For example, on one issue the Faculty Senate President was charged to send a document presenting background information and pro and con positions, as well as a ballot to the faculty of each division. The senators were responsible for (1) collecting the completed ballots for their areas and (2) voting the majority position at the Senate meeting. An example of a dilemma posed by group thinking versus individual decision making occurred in one division when the division met the afternoon before the Senate meeting. The faculty requested the results of the individual vote. The faculty and the Division Chair further discussed the issue and took a hand vote. The majority vote of the group reversed the results of the private ballot. This phenomena of individual interdependence upon a group and the power

of a group over members is explained by Newcomb (1966:5), Cartwright and Zander (1968:49-51, 104-105) and Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975:394-402), and Webber (1975:509-513). The senator expressed the change of view of his constituency and voted the view of the group decision.

Significance

Chabot College's October, 1985 "Application for Reaffirmation of Accreditation" expressed that the Faculty Senate's institutional role in governance: "The purposes of the Senate are to represent the faculty in the formation of district policy, to participate in the formation of district policy, and to act as the governing body of the faculty." The significance of the updating and the expansion of the Operating Rules into By-Laws for this project to the institution was to be 1) clarification of the operation of the organization, 2) facilitation of senators' understanding of their roles, 3) clarification of the duties and responsibilities of the offices beyond what is briefly stated in the Constitution, 4) addition of the flexibility and structure of the agenda, 5) improvement in the operation of the meetings, and 6) procedures for voting on significant issues affecting all faculty. These changes would allow the Senate to focus more on governance participation relating to institutional or faculty issues or concerns and less on its internal operation, politics, and interpersonal relations.

The study of the Faculty Senate's operational functions and the development of By-Laws for the Senate is appropriate to the seminar on Governance because it involves a governance process in an organizational unit within an educational institution. The Nova syllabus for Governance

(1983:41), refers to governance as the process of making decisions in an institution and states that "leaders . . . should make the development and maintenance of an effective system of governance a top priority for concerted study and action." This project deals with that priority.

The Faculty Senate is a legislated, formal organization within the governance structure of local California community colleges. The Nova syllabus (1983) notes that "each organization can be viewed as a social system comprised of many inter-related subsystems which result in a need for examining both the internal and external environments of the organization." This project focuses on the procedural processes of a local Faculty Senate which relate to its internal decision-making processes that affects the effectiveness of its role in college governance within the institution.

Furthermore, the Nova syllabus (1983:19) states that "the style and expectations of the organization itself should be thoroughly understood since the organization presses upon the individual as well as the individual upon the organization." Connected with that is the development or evolution of group norms and group processes from which the structure and the bylaws are vehicles either to hinder or to facilitate faculty participation in expressing opinions on issues and in decision making. This relates to the participatory governance and shared authority with administration.

Review of the Literature

The extensive Twentieth Century literature on organizations revealed that organizations are complex, human-developed entities. Barnard (1938 and 1968:4), an early writer on organizations, described a formal

organization as "that kind of cooperation among men that is conscious, deliberate, purposeful" and that effectiveness is accomplishing the organization's purposes. Writers, such as Blau and Scott (1962) and Etzioni (1964), presented organizations as social units established to deal with certain goals. Later writers, such as Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975:69-71), Khandwalla (1977:2-6), and Hersey (1982:6), delved into the complex elements encompassing sub-units and their relationships to each other and to the whole. Scott (1987:20) submitted that organizations were systems of elements, which included the environment, goals, social structure, participants, and the work to be performed (technology). He concluded that the essence of an organization would be missed if only one element were emphasized to the exclusion of the others.

Scott's (1987) composite included external factors, which fit faculty senates, and was used as the model for directing the literature review in the search for factors that needed to be considered for this study's development of rules and procedures for a community college Faculty Senate. This premise was supported by Khandwalla's (1977:225) recount of Leavitt's examination of interactions within an organization:

> a change in any one of the tasks of the organization, its structure, the techniques and technology utilized in it, or the human or 'people' part of the organization can trigger changes in the other three.

Scott (1987:337) contended that adaptation alone can determine an organization's effectiveness because the organization can survive while, at the same time, not serving the interests of the external constituencies.

Today's Faculty Senate organization at Chabot College is an entity that has evolved from the following elements: (1) environmental forces external to the institution and to the organization; (2) special

characteristics of voluntary organizations; (3) the nature of organizational structures; (4) structure and rules used to facilitate exchange of information and decision making; and (5) individual and group behavior.

External Factors Affecting the Role of Faculty Senates

Baldridge, et al. (1978), Keller (1983:164-5), Nova (1983:18) and Scott (1987:19-20) explained that external environmental factors press upon and influence the structural features and formal components, such as rules, of organizations. Pressures, such as those discussed by The American Association of University Professors (1963:293), Bandley (1967) and Capper and Gaddy (1969), had been exerted on California legislatures to allow two-year college faculty to have more input into local policy making through faculty senates and collective bargaining organizations. The resulting legislation--ACR 48 of 1963, the Winton Act of 1965, SB 106 (the Rhodda Act) of 1975--and the changes to the California Administrative Code in Title 5 forced adjustments to the function and goals of the Faculty Senates. These changes, in turn, forced internal changes to structures and rules of the local senates.

While in the 1960's community college faculty talked about "shared authority" (Bentley:1966, Weber:1967, Capper and Gaddy:1969), the conversations of the 1980's by state faculty leaders, such as Baradat (1980), Decker (1984), and Edelstein (1985), involved collective, cooperative faculty involvement within the administration of colleges under a new term, "shared governance." In 1988, the legislature passed Assembly Bill 1725, which encourages shared governance between the faculty and administration in community colleges. Various factors of this legislation have exerted more pressures on local faculty senates to run effective meetings. Axen and Hannan (1988:1) suggested that senates

could be more effective if they would be more proactive, rather than reactive, in responding to issues developed by forces outside the senate.

The Faculty Senate as a Voluntary Organization

The local Faculty (Academic) Senates at community college campuses serve to represent the faculty segment of the institutions and are essentially voluntary, nonprofit enterprises within the postsecondary sector. As a result, faculty can choose to participate actively by serving on the elected Senate, or serve in the parallel role of general citizens to elected public officials. Mason (1984:11) explained the importance of such voluntary organizations in relationship to "successful democracy and our social system":

> Our traditional image views the voluntary sector as providing this involvement of carrying out such functions as instituting information and education procedures; communicating values; bringing about orderly conflict-resolution and nonviolent confrontation; blending disparate subgroups; providing education in organizational methodology; supporting existing institutions; advocating new causes; providing mechanisms for identifying problems; feeding back opinions; instituting social reforms; building national loyalty and cohesion; guarding pluralism, altruism, self-help, and democratic action; and erecting defenses against alienation.

Rose (Glaser and Sills, 1966:57-58) explained that voluntary associations provide basic functions to its members: (1) they inform; (2) they provide an avenue for understanding some of the controls [of society]; and (3) they allow members to learn the problems of the power structure. Tropman (1980:9-21) and Mason (1984) discussed the distinctive challenges and multiplicities involved in the processes of operations in voluntary organizations.

Wright and Hyman's (Glaser and Sills, 1966:32-38) reported on national surveys showed "that a sizable group of Americans are not members of any voluntary associations and that only a minority belong to

more than one such organization." On the other hand, Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975:75) and Scott (1987:17) commented that an individual may be simultaneously a member of two or more formal groups within the total organization resulting in multiple influences on an individual's behavior. Gunne and Mortimer (1974) and Birnbaum (1980:226) indicated the relunctance and "ambivalence" of faculty involvement "not only in activities that reflect their roles as employees, but also in processes that in other settings are clearly the perogatives of management." Baldridge, et al. (1978:69-79) concurred.

The Nature of Organizational Structures and Procedures for Faculty Senates

Drucker (1986:216) related that ". . . the right structure does not guarantee results. But the wrong structure aborts results and smothers even the best-directed efforts." Sturgis (1966) agreed. Wright (1967:34) concluded that there are two species of internal organizational structure for faculty governance through senates: (1) the committee of faculty from various parts of the college community and (2) the comprehensive assembly, "which functions like a 'town meeting.'" Case (1968), Case (1971:23), and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (1984:III-I) provided different descriptions of organizational structure for local faculty senates: (1) a senate of the whole, (2) a senate of the whole, with an elected representative body, and (3) a senate as an elected body of representatives. Hodgkinson (1974:39-42) delineated the methods of selection of representatives to campus senates through elections and appointments. Wright (1967:34-35, 40) described "pure" senates comprised exclusively of faculty and "mixed" senates comprised of faculty and administrators. Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975:89-90) described this relatively flat organizational

structure as horizontal differentiation, wherein functional activities are divided among individuals at approximately the same authority and responsibility level.

Cartwright (1968:103) referred to Indik's study of organizations in relating size to individual satisfaction; the findings showed that larger groups "do have more difficulties of communication and less satisfaction from work." Pfeffer (1981:27) referred to Blau and Schoenherr's 1971 determination that organizations have greater reliance on procedures and rules as they become larger. Connected with that element is the challenge of dealing with a changing membership of the organization, as discussed by Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975:97-98) and Scott (1987:23). Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975:249) reported on the Pugh-Hickson 1969 research that showed that the size of the organization's membership influenced the structuring of such activities as standardization of functions, specialization of roles, and formalization of procedures.

Interfacing the characteristics of the organization is the activities structure dimension--i.e., whether or not the tasks are highly specified and structured. Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975:260-262) summarized from Hickman's 1966 work:

> Those who advocate high degrees of specificity see the advantages as basically 'bringing order out of chaos' and preventing wasted effort by organization members. Those who prescribe less structuring of activities see the advantages in terms of greater member creativity, commitment, and motivation.

Morse and Lorsch (1970) emphasized that the structure and rules of an organization need to fit with the nature of the tasks to be done and with the personalities of the people involved. Tead (1951:22-41) suggested that attaining complete unity of aim and motive of all employees

[faculty] is difficult; however, complete functional unity can be a long-range possibility. The Salancik and Pfeffer (Pfeffer, 1978) study found that "the content and dimensions of jobs . . . were partly the result of the perceptions that were subject to social influences."

Nova (1983:15) related the following attitudes of faculty:

> As professionals, faculty and administrators expect a high degree of self-determination in directing individual activities and efforts. On the other hand, there is the desire for unity and cooperation.

The individualism and isolation, which are inherent properties in teaching (Deegan, Tillery, and Associates,1985:83), contribute to the difficulties of effective group participation, cutting across the college's disciplines. Dr. Richard Axen's (1987:2) "Proposal for a Center for the Study of California Community College Faculty Governance," stated that

> . . . faculty governance faces many barriers. It is a collective activity--faculty are supreme individualists; it is political--faculty often are apolitical or anti-political; it concerns management and budget--faculty have little training or interest in either area; it is often institutionally focused--faculty are classroom and department focused; it is a fringe, part-time activity discontinuous by nature--management is a full-time, continuous activity. Thus, if faculty are serious about pressing for power in such areas as educational policy and personal decisions, they need to develop an effective mechanism.

Miller (1979:221-225) expressed the importance of organizational procedures and/or rules as mechanisms to facilitate the operation of Boards of Trustees. He quoted Zwingle and Mayville's view that "Bylaws are intended to specify the procedures to be followed by the board; bylaws are subject to neglect and are frequently out of date." Sturgis (1964:205) stated that "good bylaws alone do not make an effective organization . . . However, suitable bylaws are necessary to enable an organization to function well." Other writers, such as Whitney (1962),

Kast and Rosenzweig (1979:296), Tropman (1980), Robert (1984), Zander (1983:8), Palmer and Palmer (1983), and Stech and Ratcliffe (1985) indicated that in order for meetings to be effective, there must be a system of rules, policies, and/or required practices designated as standards of behavior to assure good and fair group communications and participation.

Constitutions, By-Laws

A literature search at the University of California Educational Psychology library, an ERIC search, and a review of the Academic Senate Resource Book (1987), did not provide any example of constitutions or bylaws for local faculty senates. The By-Laws and Standing Rules for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Inc. were available in the Academic Senate Resource Book (1987). Various writers, such as McConnell and Mortimer (1971), Millett (1978), Floyd (1985:26), and Birnbaum (1987), have studied university and four-year college faculty senates but did not delve into governance structure. Walker and Poythress (1983) reported on the tasks of DeKalb Community College's new Faculty Senate on multiple campuses in Georgia. Hodgkinson (1974) studied senate size, frequency of meetings, selection processes of council representatives, and attitudes of effectiveness in institutions of higher education. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (1984) provided a reference document to local senates that suggested structural options. Prentiss (1986) studied the effectiveness, but not the structure, of the California Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Case (1968) studied faculty's and Senate President's views on codifying senate procedures into constitutions, by-laws, and standing rules.

Gollattscheck (Deegan and Gollatscheck, 1985:87) and Axen (1987) commented that the literature provided research and training in all other areas of postsecondary education but not much in academic governance in the community colleges. The literature was searched, therefore, for information the areas of constitutions, by-laws, and operating rules. Matejko (1986) commented that "rules, procedures, and policies are needed to keep order . . . [but] in the struggle between stability and flexibility the role of rules is to mark compromise."

Bentley (1966) and Wright (1967:39-43) stated that an organizational structure, along with procedures, have to be established to effectuate the faculty role in governance. Webber (1975:437) agreed but added that no structure strategy should be permanent.

Robert (1984:10) referred to an organization's constitution or bylaws as "document(s) which . . . contain its own basic rules relating principally to itself as a society [organization], rather than to the parliamentary procedure that it follows." He indicated that many organizations combine constitutions and bylaws into a single document.

Sturgis (1966:202-203), the parliamentary code presently used by Chabot College's Faculty Senate, provided some background to the variety of approaches. Sturgis stated that

> Some organizations adopt both a constitution and bylaws. The constitution establishes the fundamental framework of the organization, and to amend it usually requires a higher vote than the bylaws. The bylaws supplement these fundamental provisions and are easier to amend.
>
> Most organizations combine the provisions of a constitution and bylaws in one document called bylaws. A single document is more practical because all provisions relating to one subject are in one place.

Other than the level of difficulty of the amendment procedure, Sturgis does not provide any distinguishing factors between a constitution and

by-laws if both are used. Sturgis (1966:203), Samit (1978), and the Teamsters Union (1978) expressed that local documents of an organization must be in compliance with those of the "parent" organization's constitution or charter or bylaws.

By-Laws. Rice (1983:52) defined By-laws ~~as "Regulations or rules~~ adopted by an organization for its management." Black (1968:252) and Black, Nolan, and Connolly (1983:104) defined By-laws as "Regulations, ordinances, rules or laws adopted by an association or corporation or the like for its government." Ballentine (1969:166) provided the following:

> Rules and regulations, adopted for their government by corporations, unincorporated associations, business trusts, fraternal orders and benefit societies, and benevolent associations, clubs, and societies, which, if not in violation of statue or the charter [constitution] of the body, must be applied within the body indetermining the manner of conduct of the business and the rights and liabilities of members.

Palmer and Palmer (1983:115) stated that while bylaws can provide the group's foundation for self-governance, they can also build on and amplify provisions of constitutions and other founding documents.

Mancuso (1986:106) explained that after the Articles of Incorporation have been certified by the Secretary of State that bylaws should be prepared to serve certain important purposes: (1) provide specific information about the organization and its operation "(i.e., number of directors, quorum requirements, dates of meetings)" and (2) provide "a practical yet formal set of rules for the operation of the corporation." Palmer and Palmer (1983:115) reported that public boards use bylaws to supplement the state statute provisions directing their purposes and procedures.

Constitutions. Black (1968:384) and Black, et. al (1983:163) defined a constitution as the following:

> The organic and fundamental law of a nation or state, which may be written or unwritten, establishing the character and conception of its government, laying the basic principles to which its internal life is to be conformed, organizing the government, and regulating, distributing, and limiting the functions of its different departments, and prescribing the extent and manner of the exercise of sovereign powers. A charter of government deriving its whole authority from the governed.

Ballentine (1969:253) also referred to a constitution as being "fundamental law or principles." He extended its application beyond that of government to corporations and other aggregations of individuals.

The Guide to American Law (1983:346-347) distinguished associations from other organizations and gave the following information:

> A constitution of an association regulates its powers, rights, duties, and liabilities. Generally, it is designed to define the members' privileges and duties. An association has a considerable amount of latitude in rule making so that its objectives can be accomplished. Rules adopted are generally in accordance with the association's goal and purpose for existence. A constitution and bylaws are an enforceable contract between the members of an association.

Pantzer (1968:29-31) provided the following advice:

> Whether given provisions should be inserted in a charter, in the bylaws, or in another document is determined by weighing various considerations, except in the relatively few cases in which the governing act [legislation] compels the choice.

Pantzer suggested that the choice usually pertains to "'control' considerations that relate to the levels of difficulty for amendment--i.e., constitutions or charters often require public filing and require a vote of the whole constituency, whereas bylaws can be amended by representatives of the whole.

Group Interactions in Organizations

Olson (1971:6) stated that one purpose of organizations was to further the interests of its members. Pfeffer (1981:181) stated that "Organizations are social systems which are populated by individuals who

come with norms, values, and expectations . . ." Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975:74-75) stated that "people do not relate to organizations as isolated individuals. Normally, . . . they are parts of groups . . . [with] multiple influences on the individual's behavior." Webber (1975:508-513, 532-534) discussed the social pressures of groups which lead to conformity and interdependence. Cartwright and Zander (1968:485-492), as well as Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975:368-402), elaborated upon social influences in organizations which develop into group norms in relationship to structural properties of groups.

Pfeffer (1981:266) stated that organizational structures have a problem in design; the structure is usually the outcome of political contests for control. He (1981:122-129) also indicated that subunits within an organization can gain political advantage when there is consensus sharing that can be articulated and understood. He referred to Child's (1972) findings that "every one in the organization wants as much decision making control as possible . . . " Pondy (1967 and 1969), Schmidt and Kochan (1972), and Hage (1980:321) point out that when organizations include conflict as an essential idea, there may be conceptual and operational difficulties. Scott (1987:324) explained that political organizations "allow for divergence and conflict of interests among participants but presume their resolution through negotiation and power processes." Baldridge (1971) concurred.

In coping with the individuals joined into a group, Sturgis (1966), Tropman (1980) and Stech and Ratcliffe (1985) explained the roles of the chair and group members, the preparation needed for a meeting, the integrity of the agenda, participation control, and agenda-relevant minutes. Zander (1983) gave advice on making a group more effective

internally and on improving relations between groups. Newcomb (1966:2-16) discussed the of peer group influence over individuals in influencing decisions made.

PROCEDURES

The purpose of the study was (1) to review the literature on primary and supplemental documents which affected an organization's operations, (2) to examine the operating procedures and/or bylaws of effective faculty senates within the bay area region of California and (3) to revise the existing Operating Rules of Chabot College's Faculty Senate into bylaws that correlated with the revised constitution. The procedures included (1) the formation of an ad hoc committee, (2) a review of the literature, (3) the collection of data from nearby Faculty Senates, (4) the consultation of state Academic Senate references, (5) meetings of the committee, and (5) evaluation and approval of the recommendations by Chabot College's Faculty Senate.

An ad hoc committee of four full-time faculty--three senators and the Past President--was appointed by the Faculty Senate President and approved by the Senate. The committee members came from different divisions and from both campuses.

At the first meeting in the autumn quarter, 1987, the ad hoc committee discussed its concerns about the conflicts of the Operating Rules to the Constitution and what additional information was needed. An outline of the order of the By-Laws was determined: (1) Duties of President and President Pro-Tempore, (2) Duties of Senators, (3) Agenda, (4) Conduct of Meetings, (5) Minutes, (6) Other. The committee decided through consensus that the facilitator would conduct a review of the

literature, contact the presidents of bay area Faculty Senates to get copies of their operational documents, and summarize the discussion of the meeting in a word processed preliminary working document.

A letter requesting a copy of the Faculty Senate constitution, By-laws, and/or Standing Rules was sent to Faculty Senate Presidents of fourteen community colleges of six districts in the greater Bay Area. A postage-paid return envelope was provided to facilitate a reply. The names and addresses were obtained from the California Community College Directory (1987).

The review of the literature provided limited information on constitutions and bylaws used by local community college faculty organizations and no clear delineation between bylaws as the primary or as the secondary document of an organization. The documents distributed by the California Academic Senate provided information on various configurations which senates could use in developing a document, but contained no examples of local senate's documents. The copy of the documents obtained from the other Faculty Senates was reviewed by the facilitator and the data was categorized.

At the second meeting, two of the committee members brought in a proposal regarding the procedures for the Senate minutes. This section was prepared for review in concept by the Senate. Given the authorization by the Senate President, the Senate's classified secretary revised the draft which was submitted to the Senate for discussion. The senators debated the sections and returned the adjusted document to the ad hoc committee for refinement of wording.

At the third meeting of the ad hoc committee, one of the faculty members resigned. The remaining three worked on the wording of the

section on minutes and on the draft of the section on agenda. It was agreed that each of the members would draft concepts on the role of senators and give to the facilitator to combine into a preliminary document for the next meeting.

At the fourth meeting, the sections on minutes and agenda were reviewed. The contents preliminary document were debated and general agreements were made. A two to one disagreement remained on the issue of voting as a representative or as oneself determined on "Significant Items."

At the fifth meeting, the remaining wording for the articles was decided upon. Draft 2 was finalized for evaluation and approval of the Faculty Senate. The recommendations for the By-Laws were listed on the agenda for three meetings and were tabled due to issues that required immediate attention and response from the Senate. During the winter and spring quarters, the Senate debated the recommendations two times. Each time the recommendations were returned for rewording by the committee. At the second to last meeting of the school year, the Draft 3 (Appendix B) recommendations were moved for adoption, and they were debated before a motion to table until the first meeting of the next school year was passed.

The Faculty Senate President met with the ad hoc committee before the end of the school year. It was agreed that the President disagreed with some items that the committee members recommended and had still another viewpoint about the two issues the members had agreed to let the Senate decide. The ad hoc committee recommended to the President that (1) a Parliamentarian needed to be appointed and (2) training in the

goals, purposes, and procedures of the Senate needed to occur at the beginning of the new school year.

During the summer, the Faculty Senate President reworked the format and contents of the proposed By-laws into two parts--the Operating Rules and Guidelines. This fourth draft was sent to the Senate's new Parlimentarian for evaluation. The resulting draft was then reviewed by the ad hoc committee for its input. Draft 5 was presented at the second Senate meeting of the 1987-88 school year. The Senate debated and altered the document during two meetings. The Operating Rules with addended Guidelines (Appendix C) were approved by the Senate body, which included five new senators who had not been involved in the original discussions.

The original intent of this practicum was to develop bylaws to build upon the framework of the Senate's constitution. But, this intent was changed to the development of Operating Rules and Guidelines by the length of time involved in the process, the change of the Senate's composition, and the Senate President's maneuvers.

Limitations

A major limitation was the difficulty in getting agreement by experts in the literature as to what comprises a constitution and what constitutes by-laws. In conjunction with those ambiguities was the difficulty of what constitutes by-laws and what constitutes Standing Rules. A second limitation dealt with the difficulty of an organization having to deal with pressing matters relating to the present and future while at the same time working on its constitution and procedures.

A significant limitation was that Chabot College's Faculty Senate did not search either the literature for information about constitutions,

bylaws, and/or operating rules or get sample documents from other local Faculty Senates when it intermittently spent almost two years (1985-1987) revising its constitution in preparation for a vote of the total faculty. This fact may have limited the importance of the concept of By-laws as procedures or regulations as a supplement to the constitution. The complexity and the fine line of differences between the definition of the documents also limited the senators' abilities to change the term heading their Operating Rules.

Although this study was useful in developing the Operating Rules and Guidelines for a community college faculty senate, its generalizability to four-year institution may be limited for at least two reasons: (1) universities and four-year colleges are oftentimes larger in size than two-year colleges and (2) universities and colleges have been created as a separate entity and have not evolved out of high schools. An additional limitation was that the generalizability to other institutions may be limited by (1) the uniqueness of faculties and California state laws, and (2) a California Bay Area bias.

Assumptions

It was assumed that the Faculty Senates of the community colleges in the Bay Area were representative of the individuality of the local Faculty Senates of the 106 community colleges throughout California. It was assumed that the structure and operating rules of each senate would relate to the different governance models exercised within its institution.

RESULTS

The procedures of this study resulted in revised Operating Rules and new Guidelines, which supplemented the 1987 revised constitution. Even though changes to either of these takes a full senate vote, similar to By-laws, the Senate voted not to label them as By-laws, as was the original intent of this study.

Letters, requesting copies of operational documents, were sent to fourteen senate presidents in the Bay Area. The response rate is indicated in Table 1. below.

TABLE 1.

Response Rate

Number Requested	Number Responses	Percentage
14	9	64%

There were nine responses to the fourteen requests, a sixty-four percent return. This provided an eight percent representation of the 106 California community colleges. The years of existence of the respondent colleges ranged from thirteen years to seventy-one years, with an average life span of thirty-eight years. The sizes of these colleges are expressed in enrollments; they ranged from 6,300 to 26,500, with a mean of 15,420. Chabot College's enrollments are 19,500 students.

The examination and analysis of the constitutions, by-laws, and standing/operating rules/Procedures from the nine community colleges reflected the individuality of approach of the faculty at each institution. The results may be found in Table 2.

TABLE 2.

Types of Official Documents Used By
Community College Faculty Senates

Constitution and By-laws		By-laws only		Constitution and Standing Rules	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
7	78%	1	11%	1	11%

Seven colleges had both a constitution and by-laws. One college's main document was a set of By-laws; it was the second oldest college included in the study. One college had a constitution and Standing Rules.

The community college faculty had choices of different kinds of structures for their faculty senates. The results may be found in Table 3.

TABLE 3.

Types of Structures for
Faculty Senates

Structure Options	N	Frequency	Percentage
At-large Representatives	9	1	11
Area Representatives	9	6	67
At-large and Area Representatives	9	1	11
Of the whole	9	1	11

The documents showed that one of the colleges had representatives selected at large and only one had a senate of the whole. The majority of sixty-seven percent had senators selected by areas. The senate, which had bylaws only, was one of the sixty-seven percent of the colleges with area representatives, thus indicating that the type of primary document had no bearing on the structure. All senates, except one, were

exclusively faculty. Some documents expressed that all faculty (regular and contract) were members of the senate; the structure included a council to represent the interests and viewpoints of constituencies.

The type of document that the nine faculty senates used to codify their rules and procedures are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4.

Type of Document Used for Written Procedures

	Constitution		By-Laws		Standing Rules		None	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Agenda	4	45	3*	33	1	11	1	11
Conduct of Meetings	2	22	3*	33	1	11	3	34
Closed Executive Sessions	1	11			1	11	7	78
Committee Appointments	4	44	3*	33	1	11	1	11
Committee Rules			2*	22			7	78
Minutes and Reports	1	11	1	11	1	11	6	67
Substantive Issue Motions with constituency input			1*	11			8	89
Vote of the senate referendum	1	11	1	11			7	78
Parliamentary Procedure	5	55	3*	34			1	11
Suspension of Rules					1	11	8	89
Duties of Officers	5	55	3*	34			1	11
Duties of Representatives	3	34	2	22			4	44

* One senate with no constitution, only By-Laws

As the data shows in Table 4, there are a variety of approaches as to what specific items appears in the different types of organizational documents. Senates were as likely to include procedures relating to

Agendas, Conduct of Meetings, Committee Appointments, and Minutes and Reports in either its primary or its secondary documents. Seventy-eight percent of the community colleges included the source of Parliamentary Procedures and Duties of Officers in its primary document, whether it was named a constitution or by-laws. Fifty-six percent of the senates had included the Duties for Representatives in any of its documents. Two senates, or twenty-two percent, had provisions for Closed Executive Sessions. Three senates provided for all faculty to have input: one senate included constituency input on Substantive Issue Motions and two senates allowed a Vote of the Whole through a Referendum.

The vote required to make changes to constitutions, bylaws, and standing rules are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5.

Votes Required to Amend

	Constitution		By-Laws		Standing Rules	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sixty Percent of Council	1	11	2	22		
Majority of Council			2	22		
Majority of Faculty Voting	5	55				
Two-thirds of faculty voting	2	22	2*	22		
Two-thirds of Senate			2	22	1	11

* One senate with no constitution, only By-Laws

Eighty-nine percent of the senates required a vote of the total contract and regular faculty to amend its primary document. All of the

senates with bylaws as secondary documents allowed the council (or senate) to amend with either a majority vote or a two-thirds vote.

The committee members reviewed the data that was summarized from the documents sent from other senates. It developed recommendations for the draft policy on By-Laws, integrating the information from (1) the literature on constitutions, by-laws, and Standing Rules, (2) the data collected, (3) documents of the Faculty Senate regarding discontent with procedures, and (4) viewpoints of the members, who were senators or the past president. The committee members agreed that they could not agree on the recommendations of two issues: the Significant Motion and an open agenda. As a result, they determined that the Senate would have to debate and determine what it wanted.

The Faculty Senate voted to continue with the Operating Rules containing four articles and to attach Guidelines for Faculty Senators. Moreover, it was decided that any change to either of these documents would require a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Senate, according to Sturgis (1966).

Changes were made to the past Operating Rules. Article I was changed by moving Section 3 on limiting guests to speak on specific agenda items to be combined with those same limitations on senators under Article II, under Conduct of Meetings. Article II was changed in two additional ways: (1) the clarification of the methodology of voting on significant issues by using a referendum and (2) the addition of the Closed Session. In Article III, the section on minutes was removed.

Guidelines were an addition to the Senate's rules. They include the following sections: (1) duties and responsibilities of faculty senators, (2) duties and responsibilities of designated senators, (3) duties and

responsibilities of the president (beyond that stated in the Constitution), and (4) procedures for the contents and review of the minutes.

The final product, which has become an official document of the Faculty Senate, is Appendix C.

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

The study resulted in the development of rules and guidelines for the Faculty Senate to supplement the constitution. These will provide a resource for present and future senate officers and faculty senate representatives. Potentially, they could contribute to improved effectiveness of the organization.

The literature provided a mixture of assistance for this study. The ad hoc committee had sought clear definitions between constitutions and By-laws. However, the information provided by parliamentary experts, such as Sturgis (1966:202-203) and Robert (1984:10), Black (1968), Black (1983), and Pantzer (1968), did not supply such clear delineations. The Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges (1984, 1987) provided options for organizational formation. Some writers, such as Barnard (1938 and 1968), March and Simon (1958), Scott (1987), on organizations suggested that people, as well as structure and tasks, be considered when determining procedures. The literature, outlined by Mason (1984), Rose (Glaser and Sills, 1966), and Wright and Hyman (Glaser and Sills, 1966) pertaining to voluntary organizations and the people who became involved or remained involved in them was helpful in drafting the proposed procedures.

The results of the collected data showed that two-thirds of the community college senates in the bay area had representatives elected from a constituency. This finding correlated with Hodgkinson's (1974:40-42) study of senates in institutions of higher education wherein the election of representatives was "the most popular pattern." The finding that only three senates required senators to consult their constituencies on substantive matters was consistent with Case's (1968 and 1976) study which showed seventy-seven percent of the forty-nine community college senates did not have such a provision.

The results of the data collection indicated that each college's Senate had developed its internal rules, principles, and regulations based upon the capabilities, interests, and expertise of the local faculty involved at any particular time. This finding supports Keller's (1983:165) view of college organizational diversity and Axen's (1987) impression that "faculty senates operate in about as many diffuse ways as the diversity of the 106 campus system might suggest." This finding also reflects Sturgis' (1966:204) belief that the bylaws of one organization may be unsuitable for another organization.

The ad hoc committee and the senate decided to abandon the piloted concept of the Significant Motion for three reasons. First, there was the potential development of the differences of votes between individual and group decision making in the constituencies, leaving the senator perplexed on which way to vote. Second, senators wanted to be able to vote their opinion based on any additional information provided. Third, other senates used a referendum process.

Sturgis (1966) indicated that an organization could combine the provisions of the constitution into one document. Only one college used

that model. The majority of senates chose the other option of adopting both a constitution as the primary framework and structure, which would be amended by the total membership and By-Laws as supplemental documents, that could be amended by the council.

The results were also indicative of the fact that the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges was formed through the local academic senates, as its By-Laws (1970) mention. Although Sturgis (1966), Samit (1978), and the Teamsters Union's view that the official documents of local chapters of state or national organizations must comply with the parent's documents, this does not (yet) apply to the local California faculty senates. In response to legislation, the original senates formed their organizations through the development of constitutions, rather than through bylaws as suggested by Palmer and Palmer (1983).

The legislation and the acts of either the State Board of Education or the newly formed Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges determined the purpose and goals of the faculty organizations. External environmental factors influenced the structural and operational features of the Faculty Senate, as suggested by Baldridge, et al. (1978), Keller (1983:164-5), Nova (1983:18) and Scott (1987:19-20) It was left, therefore, to the faculty to decide how to utilize what had been provided legally. Blau and Scott (1962:5) Etzioni (1964), and Scott (1987:21) indicated that organizations formed to set goals; the faculty did form organizations to implement the goals set through the legal system with one goal being democratic. The faculty re-oriented both their structures and procedures, as suggested by Leavitt in Khandwalla (1977:225), to adjust to the new functions and goals aiming to be more effective.

The members of the ad hoc committee were assisted by writers, such as Whitney (1962), Sturgis (1966), Kast and Rosenzweig (1979:296), Tropman (1980), Robert (1984), Zander (1983:8), Stech and Ratcliffe (1985), who provided support for rules and policies to be used to help make meetings effective.

Faculty's independence of thought, as discussed by Nova (1983:15), Deegan, Tillery, and Associates, (1985:83), and Axen (1987) was clearly demonstrated in the lengthy debates surrounding the different elements of the revision of the Operating Rules. For example, the issue of the opinion of the individual versus the will of a majority of a group represented, discussed by Tropman (1980:1-5), made the Significant Motion a controversial item because some senators did not want to be bound to vote against their own opinion by having to vote the majority view of their represented areas.

The principle of conflict and consensus, as suggested by Pondy (1967 and 1969), Schmidt and Kochan (1972), Hage (1980:321), and Pfeffer (1981:266), was exemplified by the appointed ad hoc committee members who were not always in concurrence. They brought their unresolved issues to the Senate for advice, discussion, and identification of new strategies for future recommendations. It also follows Porter, Lawler, and Hackman's (1975:260) view that members of an organization, who were the decision makers, could influence and modify the structuring of functional activities.

The human interactions based within group norms and politics within groups, as mentioned by Cartwright and Zander (1968), Pondy (1967 and 1969), Olson (1971), Schmidt and Kochan (1972), Hage (1980), Pfeffer (1981), Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975), and Webber (1975), were

factors in developing acceptable procedures. The group of senators who had worked together for a couple of years tabled the recommendations. The Senate's president indicated that he did not concur with some of the recommendations of the ad hoc committee. The group, which had changed with twenty-five percent new members in the new school year, passed the revised rules. The processes of group norms dealing with conformity and interdependence, as suggested by Webber (1975:533), may have been expressed.

Hodgkinson (1974:53) and Birnham's (1978:9-21) observations that senates do not respond quickly to problems and recommend efficient solutions because their agendas are too full, seemed to come into effect during the course of this study and during the years of the Senate's revision of the constitution. In fact, the Senate was faced with more pressing tasks than revising its rules. These were the years of input from local faculty groups into the recommendations of state groups into Assembly Bill 1725, an external environmental factor. Additionally, Chabot College, a two-campus college, was politically involved in determining to remain in that status or to move to two-college status.

Sturgis' (1966:204) suggestion that good bylaws or procedures/rules do not make an effective organization was a principle that the ad hoc committee kept in mind when it suggested orientation of representatives to the organization and meeting procedures. The concept of training faculty representatives was also supported by Hodgkinson (1974:iv).

Implications

The results of this study have several implications.

1. The revision of rules and regulations of faculty associations are not simple tasks to complete. The review of the literature on

constitutions and by-laws and collection of data implies that there are few specific parameters provided of what matters should be inserted in constitutions or by-laws. Hence, it is difficult for a faculty member to be adequately prepared for a study such as this one.

2. Faculty have not been educated or trained in either the distinctions between, or the components of, constitutions, bylaws, or standing rules.

3. It is important for any organizational body to understand the group norms and the nature of the members of the organization in the development and implementation of procedures.

4. Operating Rules can be formulated through a study.

5. Local Faculty Senate training sessions may need to be held on a yearly basis to orient the new senators and to remind the continuing senators on the local organization's framework, structure, rules, and parliamentary procedures.

Recommendations

1. Implement an annual orientation session on procedures for all senators with additional training provided new senators;

2. Provide Operating Rules and Guidelines to senators.

3. Review the rules and procedures every four years to determine if the contents of the document still meet the Faculty Senate needs.

4. Develop some form of evaluation tool to determine the effectiveness of the sections of the document.

5. Forward this study to the Valley Campus faculty to use in its efforts to write its constitution, By-laws, and/or Standing Rules, as the campus achieves to single college status.

REFERENCES

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Academic Senate Resource Book. 1987.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. By-Laws. 1970.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Toward a More Effective Senate. ED ERIC 275 383. 1984.

American Association of University Professors. AAUP Bulletin. Vol. 49, No. 3. September, 1963.

Axen, Richard. "Proposal for a Center for the Study of California Community College Faculty Governance." San Francisco State University. Presented at the Academic Senate Spring Conference. March, 1987.

Axen, Richard A. and Everett J. Hannan. "Toward a Proactive Senate." The Rostrum. Vol. 4, No. 3. February-March, 1988.

Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Baldridge, J. Victor, David V. Curtis, George Ecker, and Gary L. Riley. Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Ballentine, James A. Ballentine's Law Dictionary. San Francisco: Bancroft-Whitney Co., 1969.

Bandley, Marion. Relationships of Faculty Senates (Councils) to the Administrative Staff, Presidents and/or Superintendents, and Boards of Trustees in Sixty-Eight California Junior Colleges. ED ERIC 013 640. 1967.

Baradat, Leon. "Collegiality and Academic Senates." Presented at the Academic Senate Fall Conference, Los Angeles, 1980.

Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive.. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Bentley, Norma E. The Role of Faculty in Community College Policy Making. ER ERIC 014 268. 1966.

Birnbaum, Robert. Creative Academic Bargaining: Managing Conflict in the Unionized College and University. New York: Teachers College Press, 1980.

Birnbaum, Robert. The Latent Organizational Functions of the Academic Senate: Why Senates Don't Work but Won't Go Away. ASHE 1987 Annual Meeting Paper, 1987.

Black, Henry Campbell. Black's Law Dictionary. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1968.

Black, Henry Campbell, Joseph R. Nolan, and M. J. Connolly. Black's Law Dictionary. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1983.

Blau, Peter M. and Richard A. Schoenherr. The Structure of Organizations. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

California. Education Code: [faculty senates] California Community Colleges. Sacramento: State of California. Register 48, June, 1963.

California. Administrative Code Title 5. Chapter 1, Sub-chapter 2, Section 53200-53205, 1964.

California Association of Community Colleges. California Community College Directory. Sacramento: CACC, 1987.

Capper, Michael R. and Dale Gaddy. Faculty Participation in Junior College Governance. ED ERIC 027 886. 1969.

Cartwright, Dorwin and Alvin Zander, ed. Group Dynamics. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.

Case, Chester. Establishing Academic Senates in California Community Colleges, 1971. ED ERIC 048 847.

Case, Chester. Faculty Participation in the Governance of Junior Colleges: A Study of Academic Senates in California Junior Colleges. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968.

Chabot College. Chabot College Faculty Handbook. Hayward, California: South County Community College District, 1987.

Chabot College. "Report of the Institutional Self-Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation," South County Community College District, 1985.

Conn, Edith, ed. "60 Milestones in the History of Senates and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges." An unpublished paper. (April, 1986).

Decker, Carmen. "The Role of the Academic Senate in the Contemporary Community College." Presented at The Academic Senate Fall Conference, Los Angeles, 1984.

Deegan, William L. and James F. Gollattascheck, ed. Ensuring Effective Governance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1985.

Deegan, William L., Dale Tillery, and Associates. Renewing the American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Drucker, Peter F. Managing for Results. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1986.

Edelstein, Mark G. "Academic Quality in the California Community Colleges: A Presentation to the Master Plan Subcommittee on Future Needs." June, 1985.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Floyd, C. E. Faculty Participation in Decision Making: Necessity or Luxury? Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985.

Glaser, William A. and David L. Sills, ed. The Government of Associations Totowa, New Jersey: The Bedminster Press, 1966.

Gunne, M. G. and K. P. Mortimer. Distributions of Authority and Patterns of Governance. Pennsylvania State University: Center for the Study for Higher Education, 1974. ED ERIC 116 757.

Hage, Jerald. Theories of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980.

Hersey, Paul, and Kenneth H. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. The Campus Senate. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1974.

Kast, Fremont E. and James E. Rosenzweig. Organization and Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.

Keller, George. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in Higher Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Khandwalla, Pradip N. The Design of Organizations. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1977.

Kuh, George D. and Elizabeth J. Whitt. The Invisible Tapestry: Culture in American Colleges and Universities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1988.

Mancuso, Anthony. How to Form Your Own California Corporation. Berkeley, California: Nolo Press, 1986.

Mason, David F. Voluntary Nonprofit Enterprise Management. New York: Plenum Press, 1984.

Morse, John J. and Jay W. Lorsch. "Beyond Theory Y." Harvard Business Review. May-June, 1970.

Matejko, Alexander. The Self-Defeating Organization. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1986.

McConnell, T. R. and K. P. Mortimer. The Faculty in University Governance. Berkeley: Center for Research and Developent in Higher Education, 1971.

Millett, J. D. New Structures of Campus Power. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Newcomb, Theodore and Everett Wilson, ed. College Peer Groups. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

Nova University. Governance. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1983.

Olson, Mancur. The Logic of Collective Action. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Palmer, Barbara C. and Kenneth R. Palmer. The Successful Meeting Master Guide. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983.

Pantzer, Kurt F. and Richard E. Deer. The Drafting of Corporate Charters and Bylaws. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: American Law Institute, American Bar Association Committee on Continuing Professional Education, 1968.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. Power in Organizations. Marshfield, Massachusetts: Pitman Publishing Inc., 1981.

Pondy, Louis. "Organizational Conflict: Concepts and Models." Administrative Science Quarterly. September, 1967.

Pondy, Louis. "Effects of Size, Complexity, and Ownership on Administrative Intensity." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1969.

Porter, Lyman W., Edward E. Lawler III, and J. Richard Hackman. Behavior in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Prentiss, Gail. "An Organizational Effectiveness Study of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. An unpublished paper presented at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Conference. Autumn, 1986.

Robert, Henry M. Robert's Rules of Order Revised. Dallas: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1984.

Samit, Jacob. A Model College Local Constitution. ED ERIC 167063. 1978.

Smith, William P., Jr. Rights and Responsibilities of California Community College Academic Senates: An Historical and Legal Analysis. ED 076 183. 1971.

Staniford, Edward F. Chabot College: The First Twenty Years. Hayward: South County Community College District, 1981.

Stech, Ernest, and Ratliffe, Sharon. Effective Group Communication. Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company, 1985.

Sturgis, Alice. Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedures. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Rice, Michael Downey. Prentice-Hall Dictionary of Business, Finance and Law. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1983.

Tead, Ordway. The Art of Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1951.

Teamster Union. How to Make Your Local By-Laws More Democratic. The Teamster Rank & File Educational & Legal Defense Foundation, 1978.

Tropman, John E. Effective Meetings. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980.

Walker, Robert and Jacque Poythress. Creating and Implementing a Faculty Senate for a Multi-Campus Community College. ED ERIC 279 358. 1983.

Weber, Arnold R. Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. Report of the AAHE Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, 1967.

Webber, Ross A. Management. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 1975.

Whitney, Byrl A. Whitney's Parliamentary Procedure. Washington, D.C.: Robert B. Luce, Incorporated, 1962.

Wright, Stephen J. Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. Report of the American Association of Higher Education Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967. ED ERIC 018 218.

Zander, Alvin. Making Groups Effective. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983

_____. The Guide to American Law. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1983.

APPENDIX A

CHABOT COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE OPERATING RULES, 1985

APPENDIX A

CHABOT COLLEGE
Faculty Senate

Operating Rules

Article I
Preparation for Faculty Senate Meetings

Section 1. Items for the Agenda shall be submitted in writing to the Faculty Senate President at least five (5) academic days prior to a meeting.

Section 2. The Agenda, significant items of business and related information shall be disseminated by the Faculty Senate President at least two (2) academic days prior to a meeting.

Section 3. Participation by a guest in Faculty Senate discussions shall be limited to specific agenda items.

Article II
Conduct of Faculty Senate Meetings

Section 1. The rules of order shall be Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure.

Section 2. Only items on the Agenda will be discussed at any meetings of the Faculty Senate.

Section 3. Voting on significant items of business shall take place at a meeting subsequent to the one at which it was introduced. Significant items of business will be determined, in accordance with Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure, by majority vote of the Faculty Senate.

Section 4. Voting on significant items of business, their amendments, and resolutions shall be recorded by tally of ayes, nays and abstentions.

Section 5. Committee reports may be discharged by a majority vote of Senators present.

Section 6. These Operating Rules may be suspended by a majority vote of the elected members of the Senate.

Article III
Internal and External Functions

Section 1. A parliamentarian shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President at the first meeting of an academic year. It is not required that this person be a Senator.

Section 2. Delegates(s) to CCJCA shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President with concurrence of the majority of the Senators present.

Section 3. Committees and sub-committees shall operate under the rules that govern the Senate.

Section 4. Minutes should be distributed to the Faculty within seven (7) academic days of a meeting of the Senate.

Chabot College
Faculty Senate
Operating Rules

Revised 10/10/85 CC:CH

APPENDIX B

DRAFT 3 OF PROPOSED BY-LAWS

Draft 3

APPENDIX B

Faculty Senate

~~Operating Rules~~

By-Laws

Article I - Officers

Section 1. The Faculty Senate President shall perform the following duties in addition to those assigned in the Faculty Senate Constitution:

a. Maintain the repository of Faculty Senate documents
b. Develop and manage the Faculty Senate Budget
c. Task the Faculty Senate Secretary
d. Attend Trustee, regional and state-wide meetings of importance to the faculty of the college
e. Share information with the collective bargaining agents, as appropriate
f. Assure that the academic concerns of the faculty are addressed by the Faculty Senate
g. Implement the directives of the Faculty Senate.

Section 2. The Faculty Senate President Pro-Tempore shall perform the duties of the Faculty Senate President in that person's absence.

Article II - Faculty Senators

Section 1. General Tasks of All Senators

The Senators

a. Attend meetings of the Senate; report back to divisions on Senate debate; bring to the Senate the views of their colleagues.

b. Conduct formal ballots in their divisions on major issues and Significant Motions, representing in such matters the will of their constituency to the Senate.

c. Read pre-meeting materials, particularly the memo from the President.

d. Review the unapproved minutes for corrections.

e. Participate as a Reader of the Minutes. (Three senators read each set of minutes prior to the completion of the Unapproved set which is provided for approval.)

f. Serve on special Faculty Senate committees, sub-committees, and task forces.

g. Help the President with special tasks relating to specific Senate concerns.

h. Share information about Faculty Senate issues and get feedback on items of interest and concern as needed.

Section 2 Special Tasks of Senior Senators

When more than one senator represents faculty from an area, the faculty member with the longest service as a senator will serve as a Senior Senator.

The Senior Senator:

a. Posts the Agenda for the upcoming Senate meeting on the division or area Faculty Senate Bulletin Board.

b. Posts a copy of the minutes (unapproved or approved) of each meeting as multiple copies become available.

c. Distributes the multiple copies received in a packet from the President or Secretary to all regular and contract faculty in the mailboxes of the division or area. (These are generally unapproved minutes.

d. Posts special information sheets sent by the President.

e. Makes reports, along with the other senator(s) at division or area meetings about Senate concerns.

f. Disseminates information on Significant Motions to the constituency and vote the view of the constituency at the Faculty Senate.

If a division or area meeting is not planned during the time the vote is to be taken, a survey should be made to assure the vote of the senator reflects the majority viewpoint of the faculty.

g. Places a copy of the posted minutes in the division or area's Faculty Senate Binder of the division or area. (At Valley, that binder has been kept in the Learning Resource Center.)

h. Submits in writing any special concerns of the division or area to the President to be included on an Agenda.

i. When the term ends for a Senator, passes information to new senators and communicate with the next Senior Senator to help that faculty member perform these expected tasks.

j. Helps orient new senators to their new role.

Article III - Written Agenda

Section 1. Items for the [~~formal~~] written Agenda will be submitted in writing to the Faculty Senate President at least five (5) academic days prior to a meeting.

Section 2. Items [~~requested~~] to be added to the formal Agenda [~~shall~~] should be submitted in writing to the presiding officer at the beginning of a meeting.

Section 3. In adding new items to the formal Agenda of a meeting, the Sturgis rules (see below, Article II, Section 1) shall be followed:

..."An agenda is flexible, and items may be changed or omitted by the presiding officer, or by unanimous consent, or a majority vote." (p. 117) and "New business (our italics) includes any proposal that any member may wish to present to the assembly, except items of business that must be presented under other divisions of the order of business. The opportunity to present new proposals continues until the meeting is declared adjourned." (p. 120)

Section 4. An early agenda item shall be set aside for a Report from the Senate to the Board of Trustees.

Section 5. An early agenda item shall be set aside for the ASCC report.

Article IV - Conduct of Faculty Senate Meetings

Section 1. The rule of order shall be Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure.

Section 2. Discussion at a meeting shall be limited, for both Senators and guests, to Agenda items.

Section 3. By majority vote of a quorum, the Senate determines whether a motion is a Significant Motion (one affecting college policy) or a Main Motion (one important to the whole faculty).

Significant Motions require responses from divisions. A Senate vote on such a motion will be postponed until the Senate meeting after the divisions have met over the motion. Votes will be recorded by roll call.

Main Motions will be voted upon one meeting after it has been presented. Votes will be recorded by AYES, NAYS, ABSTENTIONS.

Section 4. Voting on items of business, their amendments, and resolutions shall be recorded by tally of ayes, nays and abstentions.

Section 5. Committee reports may be discharged by a majority vote of Senators present.

Section 6. These Operating Rules may be suspended by a majority vote of the elected members of the Senate in order to move into a Closed Session with no minutes or guests.

Article V - Faculty Senate Appointments and Committee Rules

Section 1. A parliamentarian shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President at the first meeting of an academic year. It is not required that this person be a Senator.

Section 2. Delegate(s) to the California Association of Community Colleges (CACC) shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President with concurrence of the majority of the Senators present.

Section 3. Appointments to specific college committees or task forces shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President with concurrence of the majority of the Senators present.

Section 4. Faculty Senate committees, sub-committees, and task forces shall operate under the rules that govern the Senate.

Article VI - Minutes

Section 1. The minutes shall summarize the conversation and discussion of issues; they shall not attempt to be a verbatim presentation.

Names of senators generally shall not be used in the minutes, except in circumstances such as reporting on a conference attended on behalf of the Faculty Senate, or on voted-upon viewpoints of the area represented, or on a report from a Faculty Senate Committee, subcommittee, task force.

Section 2. A Review Committee of three senators shall be selected on a rotating basis. The names of these readers shall be recorded on the minutes they have reviewed.

Section 3. Copies of the audio-tapes of the Faculty Senate meetings shall be supplied to the three Faculty Senate readers at their request so that they may check the syntnesis and emphasis in the minutes.

Section 4. Tape reference numbers shall be placed in the margins of the Preliminary (Unapproved) Minutes.

Section 5. An invited guest speaker shall have the opportunity to review the section of the minutes reflecting that person's input and shall be allowed to suggest grammatical changes. Any substantive changes proposed by the guest speaker shall be referred by the Faculty Senate President to the Review Committee, who shall check the proposed copy against the the tapes to verify the accuracy of the minutes.

Section 6. The Preliminary minutes should be distributed to the Faculty within seven (7) academic days of a meeting of the Senate. The Senators will decide to approve the minutes at the next meeting.

Section 7. Any senator may listen to the tapes to verify the accuracy of the minutes.

Section 8. Accuracy of the minutes is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate President, the Review Committee, and the Faculty Senate as a whole.

Section 9. One complete copy of the tapes of each meeting shall be preserved for 6 months.

Section 10. Once the minutes have received approval by vote of the Faculty Senate, no further changes shall be made.

Section 11. The Preliminary Minutes are sent to the Senior Senator to be distributed to the faculty within the constituency. The Approved Minutes are sent to the Administration, Board of Trustees (through the Superintendent/President), President of CSEA, and the Learning Resource Centers at each campus.

Article VI - Internal and External Functions

Section 1. Each instructional division, Learning Resource Center, Counseling, and Valley Campus shall forward a list of senators and alternates to the Faculty Senate President.

Section 2. Each instructional division, Learning Resource Center, Counseling, and Valley Campus shall forward quarterly schedules of senators and alternates to the Faculty Senate President.

Chabot College
Faculty Senate
Operating Rules

Revised from original rules of 4/13/66: 4/22/82
10/10/85
11/10/87 cc Wang 1106R

APPENDIX C

FACULTY SENATE REVISED OPERATING RULES AND GUIDELINES, 1988

APPENDIX C

CHABOT COLLEGE
Faculty Senate

OPERATING RULES

Article I
Preparation for Faculty Senate Meetings

Section 1. Items for the agenda shall be submitted in writing to the Faculty Senate President at least five (5) academic days prior to a meeting.

Section 2. The agenda, significant items of business, and related information shall be disseminated by the Faculty Senate President at least two (2) academic days prior to a meeting.

Article II
Conduct of Faculty Senate Meetings

Section 1. The rules of order shall be **Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure.**

Section 2. Discussion at a meeting, for both senators and guests, shall be limited to agenda items.

Section 3. The senate shall determine when a motion shall be submitted to a REFERENDUM of the faculty by a majority vote of a quorum. Referenda concern matters that affect college policy and require a majority vote from divisions for passage. Senators shall help conduct ballots on referenda in their divisions and shall report the results to the senate after the divisions have conferred and voted.

Section 4. Voting on a significant item of business shall take place at a meeting subsequent to the one at which it was introduced.

Section 5. Voting on main motions, amendments, and resolutions shall be recorded by a tally of yes, no, abstentions.

Section 6. A committee report may be discharged by a majority vote of senators present.

Section 7. These Operating Rules may be suspended by a majority vote of the senators present in order to move into a Closed Session with no minutes.

continued on back

Article III
Internal and External Functions

Section 1. A parliamentarian shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President with the concurrence of a majority of the senators present at the first meeting of an academic year. It is not required that this person be a senator.

Section 2. Delegates to the California Association of Community Colleges (CACC) shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President with concurrence of the majority of the senators present.

Section 3. Appointments to specific college committees and task forces shall be made by the Faculty Senate President with concurrence of the majority of the senators present.

Section 4. Faculty Senate committees, subcommittees, and task forces shall operate under the rules that govern the Senate.

Chabot College
Faculty Senate
Operating Rules

Original rules drafted: 4/13/66
Revisions approved: 4/22/82
10/10/85
10/13/88

jlr:Wang/1288A
10/13/88

CHABOT COLLEGE
Faculty Senate

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY SENATORS

Faculty senators shall:

1. Attend meetings of the Senate.

2. Report back to divisions or areas on issues discussed at meetings; receive feedback on items of interest and concern; present to the Senate the views of their colleagues.

3. Conduct formal ballots in their divisions or areas on major issues and motions that affect college policy, representing in such matters the will of their constituency to the Senate.

   Where a division or area meeting is not planned prior to the next Faculty Senate meeting, a survey shall be made to assure the vote of the senator reflects the majority viewpoint of that division's or area's faculty.

4. Review pre-meeting materials.

5. Volunteer as a reader of the minutes. The unapproved minutes are then sent to all senators.

6. Serve on special Faculty Senate committees, subcommittees, and task forces.

7. Submit, in writing, any concerns of the division or area to the President to be included on an agenda.

Designated senators

When more than one senator represents faculty from a division or area, one of the senators (often the faculty member who has served longest on the Senate) shall be designated to:

1. Communicate and post the following information:

   a. the Senate meeting agenda

   b. a copy of the minutes (unapproved and approved) of each Senate meeting

   c. special information sent by the President

Designated senators shall, cont.:

2. Maintain a binder of minutes for division or area use.

3. Orient new senators.

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

The Faculty Senate President shall:

1. Chair bimonthly Faculty Senate meetings; prepare the agenda and other meeting materials and oversee preparation of the minutes.

2. Attend bimonthly meetings of the Board of Trustees; present Senate views and recommendations; report Board action to the Senate.

3. Serve on various committees, both those of the Senate and external to it.

4. Attend ASCCC (Academic Senate of California Community Colleges) conferences and others, as appropriate.

5. Manage the Faculty Senate budget.

6. Attend meetings with the Superintendent-President and other management staff.

7. Receive and generate correspondence.

8. Supervise the Senate secretary.

9. Speak at commencement.

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

1. Minutes shall be of a summary nature, recording Senate action and major points of discussion.

2. A review committee of three senators shall be selected on a rotating basis to read the unapproved draft minutes. The names of these readers shall be recorded on the unapproved minutes they have reviewed.

3. Copies of the audio tapes of the Faculty Senate meetings shall be supplied to the Faculty Senate readers and to any senators, at their request, so that they can verify the accuracy of the minutes.

Guidelines for Faculty Senate Minutes, cont.

4. Tape reference numbers shall be placed in the margins of the unapproved minutes.

5. One complete copy of the tapes of each meeting shall be preserved for six (6) months.

6. An invited guest speaker shall have the opportunity to review the section of the minutes reflecting that person's comments. Any substantive changes proposed by the guest speaker shall be referred by the Faculty Senate President to the review committee, which shall check the proposed copy against the tapes to verify the accuracy of the minutes.

7. Unapproved draft minutes shall be distributed to senators (who shall receive an additional copy to be posted in each division/area for faculty review) within seven (7) academic days following the Senate meeting. Minutes shall be approved at the next regular Faculty Senate meeting. [This incorporates Art. III, Sec. 4 of 10/10/85 Operating Rules]

8. Approved minutes shall be sent to all regular and contract faculty, administration, Board of Trustees, President of the CSEA, President of the CCTA, President of the ASCC, State Academic Senate, **Chabot Spectator**, and Learning Resource Centers at each campus.

9. A senator's name is generally included in the minutes when the senator introduces a significant new point. Minor additions and restated points are usually summarized in the minutes without including senators' names. At the time of speaking, senators may request that their names be included or not be included with the statement in the minutes. At the time draft minutes are reviewed for senate approval, senators may ask to have their names included or deleted in association with any points they have made. The senate as a whole has the final responsibility to approve the minutes when the senate is satisfied that the minutes accurately reflect the actions and discussion of the meeting.

Adopted: 10/13/88
Guidelines for Minutes, Section 9 adopted 11/17/88

jlr:Wang/1289A

APPENDIX D

CHABOT COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE CONSTITUTION, 1987

APPENDIX D

CHABOT COLLEGE
FACULTY SENATE

FACULTY SENATE CONSTITUTION

Preamble

We, the Faculty of Chabot College, in order to establish a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of district policies on academic and professional matters, adopt this Constitution.

Article I

Name

This organization shall be known as the Chabot College Faculty Senate.

Article II

Purposes, Scope, Powers

Section 1. All powers and responsibilities referred shall be vested in the Faculty acting through the Faculty Senate.

Section 2. The primary function of the Faculty Senate is to serve as the representative of the Faculty in making recommendations to the Administration and to the Board of Trustees in academic and professional matters. These include but are not limited to the following:

a. Academic Policies

b. Educational Expenditures

c. Institutional Philosophy

d. Instructional Services

e. Faculty Personnel Policies

f. Academic and Professional Rights and Responsibilities

g. Academic and Professional Standards

h. Student Personnel Policies

Section 3. The Faculty Senate shall present its written views and recommendations to the Board of Trustees through regularly established channels.

Section 4. The Faculty Senate shall send a representative to all meetings of the Board of Trustees. After informing the Administration, the

Faculty Senate may present its views and recommendations directly to the Board of Trustees.

Section 5. Faculty Senate action shall become effective seven (7) calendar days after its publication and distribution except where:

a. The Faculty Senate decides by a majority vote of the total Faculty Senate that action must be submitted to a vote of the Faculty for approval, or

b. A petition signed by ten (10) percent of the Faculty for a referendum is submitted to the Faculty Senate within ten (10) calendar days requesting a referendum vote of the Faculty.

1) The referendum shall be submitted to the Faculty within fifteen (15) calendar days.

2) A referendum, for passage, shall require a majority of the vote cast in the referendum.

Article III

Membership

Section 1. Qualifications for the Faculty Senate

a. The qualifications for election to the Faculty Senate shall be the same as those defined for the Contract and Regular Faculty.

b. A Faculty Senator shall be deemed ineligible to hold office if the Senator is appointed to a position defined as management.

Section 2. Composition of the Faculty Senate.

a. The President of the Faculty Senate.

b. The elected representatives from the Instructional Divisions, Learning Resource Center, Counseling, and Valley Campus.

c. The representation set forth in Section "b" shall be determined by the following formula: the total number of Contract and Regular Faculty employed in the Spring Quarter of the election year in each Instructional Division, Counseling, the Learning Resources Center, and the Valley Campus:

1) From 1 through 19: 1 Senator
2) From 20 through 39: 2 Senators
3) From 40 through 59: 3 Senators

d. The Instructional Divisions, Counseling, the Learning Resource Center, or the Valley Campus may select alternates to participate in Senate meetings when a Senator is not able to attend.

e. An ex officio, non-voting representative from the Associated Students of Chabot College.

Section 3. Election to the Faculty Senate

a. Procedures for election to the Faculty Senate shall be determined by the respective Instructional Divisions, Counseling, the Learning Resources Center, and the Valley Campus.

b. Senators shall be elected by a majority of the members of their voting area.

c. The Faculty Senate shall settle disputes in regard to elections and qualifications.

Section 4. Terms of Office

a. The term of office for Senators shall be for two years.

b. The term of office for Senators shall start at the beginning of the autumn term of the even numbered years session.

c. If a senator resigns during a term of office, a new Senator shall be elected by the same procedures outlines in Article III, Section 3.

Section 5. Recall from office:

a. A Senator may be removed from office in a manner to be determined by the appropriate Instructional Division, Counseling, the Learning Resources Center, or the Valley Campus.

ARTICLE IV

Officers

Section 1. The officers of the Faculty Senate shall be:

a. The President

b. The President Pro-Tempore

Section 2. Eligibility for Office:

a. All Officers of the Faculty Senate shall be full, Contract and Regular Faculty.

b. No Faculty member serving as president of the faculty bargaining unit shall be eligible for the office of Faculty Senate President.

Article IV

Section 3. Procedures for Elections

a. Nominations for Faculty Senate President shall be verified by an election committee to be selected by the Faculty Senate.

b. An election committee of five (5) members of the Faculty who are not candidates for office shall be selected by the Faculty Senate to prepare the ballots and act as tellers for the election.

c. The President of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by a majority of the Contract and Regular Faculty.

d. If no candidate for the office of Faculty Senate President receives a majority of the total votes cast, a run-off election shall be held between the two candidates who receive the highest number of votes.

e. Should the office of President be vacated with one year or more remaining in the term, an election shall be conducted by the election committee; otherwise, the President Pro-Tempore shall become the President for the remainder of the term of office.

f. The President Pro-Tempore shall be elected by a majority vote of the total Faculty Senate for a term of one year.

Section 4. Duties of Officers.

a. The Faculty Senate President shall preside over meetings of the Faculty Senate and meetings of the Faculty-Faculty Senate.

b. In the absence of the Faculty Senate President, the duties of that office shall be discharged by the President Pro-Tempore; or, in whose absence, by a designee chosen by a majority of the total Faculty Senate.

c. The Faculty Senate President, or designee, shall represent the opinions and votes of the Faculty Senate or the expressions of the Faculty-Faculty Senate as determined by a referendum to the Administration and to the Board of Trustees.

d. The Faculty Senate President, or designee, shall report to the Senate on all matters of academic or professional concern to the Faculty.

e. The Faculty Senate President, or designee, shall issue agendas and Faculty Senate minutes.

f. The Faculty Sente President, or designee, shall attend meetings of the Board of Trustees.

Section 5. Recall of Officers

a. Recall of a Faculty Senate Officer shall be initiated by:

1) a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the total Faculty Senate, or
2) a recall petition signed by thirty percent (30%) of the Contract and Regular Faculty.

b. A Faculty Senate Officer shall be removed by a vote of sixty percent (60%) of the total Contract and Regular Faculty.

1) A recall vote shall take place no less than 10 working days or more than 15 working days after step a.1) or 2) above.

c. A new Faculty Senate Officer shall be selected in accordance with the provisions of Article IV, Section 3.

d. A recall petition may be considered ninety (90) days after the Faculty Senate Officer has taken office.

ARTICLE V

Meetings

Section 1. Faculty Senate Meetings

a. The Faculty Senate shall meet at least once each month from September through June or as deemed necessary by the Faculty Senate President during the summer.

b. A quorum for meetings of the Faculty Senate shall be one half plus one of the Faculty Senate membership.

c. Main motions shall be approved by a majority of the Faculty Senate voting at that meeting.

d. The Faculty Senate shall determine its rules of procedures and publish its proceedings.

Section 2. Faculty-Faculty Senate Meetings

a. Meetings of the Faculty-Faculty Senate shall be called and chaired by the Faculty Senate President.

1. At the discretion of the Faculty Senate President, or
2. Upon petition of ten (10) Faculty Senate members, or

3. Upon petition of ten (10) percent of the Contract and Regular Faculty.

b. Meetings of the Faculty-Faculty Senate are advisory.

c. Proposals recommended by a Faculty-Faculty Senate meeting shall be ratified by a majority referendum of the Contract and Regular Faculty.

d. Notification of Faculty-Faculty Senate meetings shall be posted in all Contract and Regular Faculty mail boxes not less than three (3) days in advance of such meetings. Faculty-Faculty Senate meetings may meet at one (1) joint meeting or two (2) separate meetings.

e. Faculty-Faculty Senate meetings shall be called at times and places during the Contract and Regular Faculty work week.

f. A quorum for Faculty-Faculty Senate meetings that makes a recommendation shall be thirty (30) percent of the Contract and Regular Faculty from each campus.

ARTICLE VI

Amendments

Section 1. Proposed Amendments.

a. Amendments may be proposed by the Faculty or the Faculty Senate:

1. By a majority vote of the members of the Faculty Senate meeting in a regular or special meeting.

2. By a majority of the votes cast at a Faculty-Faculty Senate meeting.

3. By a petition signed by ten (10) percent of the Contract and Regular Faculty.

Section 2. Ratification of Amendments

a. Shall by by secret ballot of the entire Contract and Regular Faculty.

b. Shall require a sixty percent (60%) majority of the Contract and Regular Faculty voting.

Approved by the vote of the faculty:
November 19, 1964
Revised July 1, 1968
Revised January 23, 1969
Revised July 1, 1980
Revised June 30, 1987

Wordstar:senconst
CClough:CH,DC
5/86,6/87

APPENDIX E

ARTICLES REVISED THE FACULTY SENATE CONSTITUTION

APPENDIX E

LISTING OF ARTICLES REVISED IN CONSTITUTION

During a one and one-half year period, the contents of the Faculty Senate's 1980 Constitution were reviewed and debated by first an ad hoc committee and then the Faculty Senate.

The controversial issues included the following elements:

1) Delineatiing areas of Faculty Senate and collective bargaining responsibilities (This was not included in the Constitution.);

2) Determinating faculty representativies on the Senate--i.e., regular and contract faculty, as well as part-time faculty (The status quo of including only regular and contract faculty was not changed.);

3) Eliminating the possibility of the Faculty Senate President to serve concurrently as president of the faculty bargaining unit (This limitation was added under Article IV, Section 2b.);

4) Adding a section on the Recall of Officers (The recall of officers was added under Article IV, Section 5.);

5) Refining the mechanism employed in calling and using Faculty-Faculty Senate meetings (general faculty meetings called by the Faculty Senate President). (Article V, Section 2 was revised.)

The non-controversial issues included the following:

1) Recognizing the Livermore (Valley) Campus and equitable representation of teaching and counseling faculty from both campuses (This was added under Article III.);

2) Adding an ex-officio, non-voting representative from the Associated Students of Chabot College (This adjustment was made to Article III.).

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

DEC 15 1989